

Arjun Vasan
arjun.vasan@gmail.com
12615 193rd Street
Cerritos, CA 90703
562-900-6541
Plaintiff in Pro Per

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Arjun Vasan,
Plaintiff,
vs.
Checkmate.com, Inc.,
(dba "Checkmate"),
Defendant.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-00765-MEMF-JPR

**PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ORDER
STRIKING PRIOR COMPLAINT
IN CASE NO. 2:24-CV-11116-UA
AND DEFENDANT'S IMPROPER
CITING THEREOF IN ITS REPLY**

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Plaintiff Arjun Vasan respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of the following adjudicative fact pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b)(2):

1. The Order entered by the Honorable Dolly M. Gee on January 30, 2025, in Vasan v. Checkmate.com, Inc., Case No. 2:24-cv-11116-UA, granting Plaintiff's motion to strike

1 the complaint—which was voluntarily dismissed—in its entirety. A true and correct copy
2 of the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

3 Judicial notice is appropriate because federal courts may take notice of “matters of public
4 record,” including docket entries and orders in other proceedings. See *Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v.*
5 *Visa USA, Inc.*, 442 F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Wilson*, 631 F.2d 118,
6 119 (9th Cir. 1980).

7
8 The Order is relevant to Defendant’s Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss or
9 Transfer Venue (ECF No. 32), which cites a prior version of Plaintiff’s complaint and argues it
10 constitutes a binding admission. See Reply at 3, footnote 5. However, that document was
11 subsequently struck from the record in its entirety by court order in *Vasan v. Checkmate.com,*
12 *Inc.*, Case No. 2:24-cv-11116-UA (ECF No. 6, Jan. 30, 2025).

13 Judicial notice is necessary to clarify the status of that stricken pleading and prevent
14 further reliance on it in the record. Absent notice, Defendant may continue to improperly
15 reference that complaint in future filings, despite its legal nullity.

16 Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court take judicial notice of the
17 January 30, 2025, Order striking the complaint filed in Case No. 2:24-cv-11116-UA.
18

19
20
21 Respectfully Submitted,

22
23 **Dated:** Wednesday, April 23, 2025

24 By: Arjun Vasan

25
26 **Arjun Vasan**
27 Plaintiff In Pro Per
28

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. **CV 24-11116-UA**

Date **January 30, 2025**

Title ***Arjun Vasana v. Checkmate.com Inc., et al.***

Page **1 of 1**

Present: The Honorable **DOLLY M. GEE, CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

DEREK DAVIS

Deputy Clerk

NOT REPORTED

Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s)
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s)
None Present

**Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS—ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
STRIKE [5]**

On December 23, 2024, Plaintiff Arjun Vasana, who proceeds *pro se*, filed a complaint, but he failed to pay the required filing fee or, alternatively, submit a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. [Doc. # 1.] As a result, judges were not assigned to the case and the Clerk’s Office notified Vasana that, within 30 days, he must either pay the filing fee or submit a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* or his case would be dismissed. [Doc. # 2.] On January 22, 2025, Vasana filed two notices of dismissal dismissing the action in its entirety without prejudice, and the case was closed. [See Doc. ## 3, 4.] The dismissal was effective without a court order as Defendants had not served an answer or motion for summary judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1).

Vasana has also filed a motion to strike the complaint. [Doc. # 5 (“Mot.”).]¹ Vasana asserts the complaint was inadvertently filed and contains materials that Vasana does not wish to be part of the court record. *Id.* at 2. Vasana seeks to strike the complaint to avoid any unnecessary confusion or prejudice and requests expedited review of his motion. *Id.* Striking the complaint is largely redundant as Vasana has dismissed the action in its entirety. Nonetheless, good cause appearing due to Vasana’s representation regarding the inadvertent mistake and prompt request to strike, the Court **GRANTS** the motion. The complaint is **HEREBY STRICKEN**. The case shall remain closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹ Vasana refers to the document that he seeks to strike as the “document filed on December 26, 2024, titled ‘Arjun Vasana v. Checkmate.com Inc. et al.’” Mot. at 1. (All page references herein are to page numbers inserted by the CM/ECF system.) Although the complaint was filed on December 23, not December 26, the Court presumes Vasana is referring to the complaint.